



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| 10/609,104 | 06/26/2003 | Cezary Marcjan | 1026-094/MMM 303082.01 | 9236 |
| 27195 | 7590 | 08/22/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114 | | | BAYERL, RAYMOND J | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2173 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/609,104

Applicant(s)

MARCJAN ET AL.

Examiner

Raymond J. Bayerl

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19 - 22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8 Jun, 22 Jul 2005.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. ("Cohen"; US #6,507,845 B1) in view of Sluiman et al. ("Sluiman"; US #6,098,072).

As per independent claim 1's "object access control graphical user interface", Cohen discloses that two separate regions of a screen display (Abstract; fig 10) show a list of users in association with an activity ("at least one of the computer spaces corresponding to access to the computer object for one or more computer users") and a list of data objects in association with an activity (suggesting a secondary region like those among the "computer spaces", one that has something to do with other aspects of access). In the fig 10 example, Cohen shows "a name field" as Blake Matter, with an assortment of documents—Response, Sett. Offer, etc. See also col 6, line 35 – col 7, line 3).

RJ3

Cohen, while showing items in association with the overall task interface, does not **explicitly** show that this member of "spaces" is "corresponding to access to the computer object from one or more computer locations". However, Sluiman teaches that a physical location can appear in an interface in conjunction with contextual view hierarchies that contain only references to the physical location (Abstract; fig 2), when presenting a FILE DIRECTORY. See also col 3, lines 32 – 56. The physical location in Sluiman is an indication of "access to the computer object" being available "from one or more computer locations" that objects will occupy.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to produce an "interface" for "controlling access to a computer object" in which "users" appear in conjunction with an object "name", as per Cohen, but with the secondary Cohen "space" having the alternative of indications of "access to the computer object from one or more location" as per Sluiman, so as to increase the flexibility the user has in accessing files distributed within a directory system. Motivation rests at least in Sluiman for such an adaptation, since it is seen there that both physical and contextual views in an interface are valuable in referencing an object.

Claim 2's use of "one of plural communication formats" to provide for "spaces" for "users" reads upon Cohen's option menu UI 240 (col 8, lines 51 – 61). The "communication" enabled can extend to email (claim 3) or a chat window, which provides claim 4's "instant messaging".

Claim 5's "plural selectable computer spaces" that are in a "ranked sequence" is suggested by the indication of current or most recent activity as retrieved from a history file (col 6, lines 35 – 45; fig 10), with this being "determined automatically from user computer interactions" (claim 6) that produce the activity indications.

The interface as presented in Cohen is of a coherent nature, and thus, the "spaces" can be seen as "listed together in a single access control field" (claim 7). Alternatively, the two regions for users and documents reasonably reads upon "separate respective access control fields" (claim 8) as well.

As per claim 9, the region for document components in Cohen is certainly a “flat representation”, without the “hierarchy” that one would find in the true physical location indicators of Sluiman, should that option be exercised and full pathnames revealed.

Claims 10 – 18, drawn to “software” “In a computer readable medium”, have the same basic functional limitations as respective “user interface” claims 1 – 9, and are rejected using lines of reasoning similar to those given above.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 7 June 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After stating at page 7 of the remarks that “[t]he subject invention relates to controlling access to computer objects based on the computer space from which access will occur” and providing an example of accesses of “Users A and B”, “User C”, attempting access from “Networks X and Y”, “Network Z”, applicant argues that in Cohen, “[n]either window shows any control of access to documents from either a computer location or a computer user”. However, Cohen provides an identical teaching of “spaces corresponding to access to the computer object for one or more computer users”, since users that access the indicated objects in the Cohen interface will form a “space” whose members are indeed indicated in the interface. The provision of a second indication of “spaces corresponding to access to the computer object from one or more computer locations” is then rendered obvious by combination with Sluiman—the physical locations are “locations” “from” which “access” may be achieved.

Applicant then argues at page 7 that “Cohen, *et al.* fails to discuss control of access to documents.”, but what is shown in Cohen is an interface by which user

access to the object relating to the Blake Matter is possible. Thus, it is “for controlling access to a computer object”, in that a user having the interface is able to make use of it in the “access” instances that make up the collaborative effort. The Examiner is not permitted to “read in” to the words “control” and “controlling” the limitations applicant would desire, in order to avoid reading upon a prior art interface that also provides control over the individual “object” accesses of individual users as they go about working on the task that may be selected.

Applicant argues further on page 7 that “Sluiman, *et al.* also fails to teach or suggest control of access to documents”, by “providing alternate directory views of source code files in a file directory system to accommodate the differing requirements of users of those files.” However, in giving views that permit “access”, Sluiman, like Cohen, is “controlling access”, by exerting a supervisory function over how the users may then proceed in accessing the indicated files. In such an arrangement, by the indication of physical locations, Sluiman then teaches a provision of information existing in “computer spaces corresponding to access to the computer object from one or more computer locations”, since the physical locations are those “computer locations” “from” which “access” may be accomplished—an actual physical storage location, for example, will be the point of “access”.

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within


Art Unit: 2173

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond J. Bayerl whose telephone number is (571) 272-4045. The examiner can normally be reached on M - Th from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM ET.

6. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (571) 272-4048. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by FAX **must be directed** to the central FAX number (571) 273-8300.

7. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.


RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173

9 August 2005